



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

John Marin, Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Gina Langford, Coordinator

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY

MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION FOR PUBLIC REVIEW

The project listed below was reviewed for environmental impact by the Placer County Environmental Review Committee and was determined to have no significant effect upon the environment. A proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration has been prepared for this project and has been filed with the County Clerk's office.

PROJECT: B&G Excavation, Inc. (PDSC T20060630)

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Proposed to pave 14,360 sf of existing dirt parking and storage area, construction of a new 4,225 sf commercial building, and a 3,250 sf covered parking and storage area.

PROJECT LOCATION: 7011 Donner Road, Tahoe Vista, Placer County

PROPONENT: Ogilvy Consulting, PO Box 1636, Kings Beach CA 96143 (530) 546-2632

The public comment period for this document closes on **May 21, 2007**. A copy of the Mitigated Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter (3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603) and at Kings Beach Public Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified of the upcoming public hearing. Additional information may be obtained by contacting Peg Rein, 530-745-3075, at the Environmental Coordination Services between the hours of 8:00 a.m. and 5:00 p.m.

Newspaper: Sierra Sun

Publish date: Thursday, May 19, 2007



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

John Marin, Agency Director

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

Gina Langford, Coordinator

NEGATIVE DECLARATION

In accordance with Placer County ordinances regarding implementation of the California Environmental Quality Act, Placer County has conducted an Initial Study to determine whether the following project may have a significant adverse effect on the environment, and on the basis of that study hereby finds:

- ☐ The proposed project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment; therefore, it does not require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report and this **Negative Declaration** has been prepared.
- ☒ Although the proposed project could have a significant adverse effect on the environment, there will not be a significant adverse effect in this case because the project has incorporated specific provisions to reduce impacts to a less than significant level and/or the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **Mitigated Negative Declaration** has thus been prepared.

The environmental documents, which constitute the Initial Study and provide the basis and reasons for this determination are attached and/or referenced herein and are hereby made a part of this document.

PROJECT INFORMATION

Title: B & G Excavation, Inc.	Plus# PDSC T20060630
Description: Proposed to pave 14,360 square feet of existing dirt parking and storage area, construction of a new 4,225 square feet commercial building, and a 3,250 square feet covered parking and storage area.	
Location: 7011 Donner Road, Tahoe Vista	
Project Owner: Guy Meerschaert, PO Box 315, Carnelian Bay, CA 96140	
Project Applicant: Ogilvy Consulting, PO Box 1636, Kings Beach, CA 96143 (530) 546-2632	
County Contact Person: Stacy Wydra	530-581-6288

PUBLIC NOTICE

The comment period for this document closes on **May 21, 2007**. A copy of the Negative Declaration is available for public review at the Community Development Resource Agency public counter and at the Kings Beach Library. Property owners within 300 feet of the subject site shall be notified by mail of the upcoming hearing before the Zoning Administrator. Additional information may be obtained by contacting the Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, at (530) 745-3132 between the hours of 8:00 am and 5:00 pm at 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603.

If you wish to appeal the appropriateness or adequacy of this document, address your written comments to our finding that the project will not have a significant adverse effect on the environment: (1) identify the environmental effect(s), why they would occur, and why they would be significant, and (2) suggest any mitigation measures which you believe would eliminate or reduce the effect to an acceptable level. Regarding item (1) above, explain the basis for your comments and submit any supporting data or references. Refer to Section 18.32 of the Placer County Code for important information regarding the timely filing of appeals.

Recorder's Certification

POSTED 04/17/2007
Through _____
JIM MCCAULEY, COUNTY CLERK
By J. Hedman
Deputy Clerk



COUNTY OF PLACER
Community Development Resource Agency

**ENVIRONMENTAL
COORDINATION
SERVICES**

John Marin, Agency Director

Gina Langford, Coordinator

3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190 • Auburn • California 95603 • 530-745-3132 • fax 530-745-3003 • www.placer.ca.gov/planning

INITIAL STUDY & CHECKLIST

This Initial Study has been prepared to identify and assess the anticipated environmental impacts of the following described project application. The document may rely on previous environmental documents (see Section C) and site-specific studies (see Section I) prepared to address in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project.

This document has been prepared to satisfy the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) (Public Resources Code, Section 21000 et seq.) and the State CEQA Guidelines (14 CCR 15000 et seq.) CEQA requires that all state and local government agencies consider the environmental consequences of projects over which they have discretionary authority before acting on those projects.

The Initial Study is a public document used by the decision-making lead agency to determine whether a project may have a significant effect on the environment. If the lead agency finds substantial evidence that any aspect of the project, either individually or cumulatively, may have a significant effect on the environment, regardless of whether the overall effect of the project is adverse or beneficial, the lead agency is required to prepare an EIR, use a previously-prepared EIR and supplement that EIR, or prepare a Subsequent EIR to analyze the project at hand. If the agency finds no substantial evidence that the project or any of its aspects may cause a significant effect on the environment, a Negative Declaration shall be prepared. If in the course of analysis, the agency recognizes that the project may have a significant impact on the environment, but that by incorporating specific mitigation measures the impact will be reduced to a less than significant effect, a Mitigated Negative Declaration shall be prepared.

A. BACKGROUND:

Project Title: B&G Excavation, Inc.	Plus#: PDSC T20060630
Entitlements: Minor Use Permit	APN 112-050-008
Site Area: 1.01 acres / 44,004 square feet	
Location: 7011 Donner Road, Tahoe Vista	
<p>Project Description: The applicants are proposing to construct a 4,284 square foot commercial/light industrial building with 3,250 square feet of covered storage and associated improvements, including but not limited to paving, water quality, BMP's, and structural improvements. The site is currently occupied by B&G Excavation, a construction service which is an allowed use within the Public Service/Light Industrial area. The property currently contains a large area of disturbance consisting of gravel, dirt, and A/C paving. There is a stream environment zone (SEZ) along the southern and western portions of the property.</p> <p>The project proposes paving 14,360 square feet of the existing dirt parking and outdoor storage area; construction of a new 4,284 square foot commercial/light industrial building with 3,250 square feet of covered parking and storage areas. The project also proposes to incorporate a fueling station, a designated truck wash area, and twenty-one parking spaces. The total proposed coverage is approximately 21,835 square feet, for a net reduction of 2,500 square feet of coverage, which is to be restored and revegetated. Water quality improvements (BMP's) will be installed in associated with the proposed project. There will be no specimen trees removed and landscaping is proposed to be incorporated into the design of the project.</p>	

B. ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING:

Location	Zoning	General Plan / Community Plan	Existing Conditions & Improvements
Site	Public Service, Industrial	Public Service, Industrial	Disturbed, Consisting of gravel, dirt, and A/C paving
North	Same as project site	Same as project site	North Tahoe Recreational Park lands
South	Plan Area Statement 024A, North Tahoe Recreation Area	North Tahoe, Tahoe Vista	North Tahoe Public Utility District Building and Maintenance Yard
East	Same as project site	North Tahoe, Tahoe Vista Special Area #5	Sierra Pacific Power Company
West	Plan Area Statement 024A, North Tahoe Recreation Area	North Tahoe, Tahoe Vista	North Tahoe Public Utility District Building and Maintenance Yard and North Tahoe Recreational Park, trails, soccer fields, etc.

C. PREVIOUS ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT:

The County has determined that an Initial Study shall be prepared in order to determine whether the potential exists for unmitigatable impacts resulting from the proposed project. Relevant analysis from the County-wide General Plan and Community Plan Certified EIRs, and other project-specific studies and reports that have been generated to date, were used as the database for the Initial Study. The decision to prepare the Initial Study utilizing the analysis contained in the General Plan and Specific Plan Certified EIRs, and project-specific analysis summarized herein, is sustained by Sections 15168 and 15183 of the CEQA Guidelines.

Section 15183 states that “projects which are consistent with the development density established by existing zoning, community plan or general plan policies for which an EIR was certified shall not require additional environmental review, except as may be necessary to examine whether there are project-specific significant effects which are peculiar to the project or site.” Thus, if an impact is not peculiar to the project or site, and it has been addressed as a significant effect in the prior EIR, or can be substantially mitigated by the imposition of uniformly applied development policies or standards, then additional environmental documentation need not be prepared for the project solely on the basis of that impact.

Section 15168 relating to Program EIRs indicates that where subsequent activities involve site-specific operations, the agency should use a written checklist or similar device to document the evaluation of the site and the activity, to determine whether the environmental effects of the operation were covered in the earlier Program EIR. A Program EIR is intended to provide the basis in an Initial Study for determining whether the later activity may have any significant effects. It can also be incorporated by reference to address regional influences, secondary effects, cumulative impacts, broad alternatives, and other factors that apply to the program as a whole.

The following documents serve as Program-level EIRs from which incorporation by reference can occur:

- ➔ County-wide General Plan EIR
- ➔ North Tahoe General Plan

The above stated documents are available for review Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, 3091 County Center Drive, Auburn, CA 95603 and/or Placer County Planning Department, Tahoe Division, 565 West Lake Boulevard, Tahoe City, CA 96145.

D. EVALUATION OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:

The Initial Study checklist recommended by the State of California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) Guidelines is used to determine potential impacts of the proposed project on the physical environment. The checklist provides a list of questions concerning a comprehensive array of environmental issue areas potentially affected by the project (see CEQA Guidelines, Appendix G). Explanations to answers are provided in a discussion for each section of questions as follows:

- a) A brief explanation is required for all answers including “No Impact” answers.
- b) “Less Than Significant Impact” applies where the project’s impacts are insubstantial and do not require any mitigation to reduce impacts.

- c) "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures" applies where the incorporation of mitigation measures has reduced an effect from "Potentially Significant Impact" to a "Less than Significant Impact." The County, as lead agency, must describe the mitigation measures, and briefly explain how they reduce the effect to a less-than-significant level (mitigation measures from earlier analyses may be cross-referenced).
- d) "Potentially Significant Impact" is appropriate if there is substantial evidence that an effect may be significant. If there are one or more "Potentially Significant Impact" entries when the determination is made, an EIR is required.
- e) All answers must take account of the entire action involved, including off-site as well as on-site, cumulative as well as project-level, indirect as well as direct, and construction as well as operational impacts [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(a)(1)].
- f) Earlier analyses may be used where, pursuant to the tiering, Program EIR, or other CEQA process, an effect has been adequately analyzed in an earlier EIR or Negative Declaration [CEQA Guidelines, Section 15063(c)(3)(D)]. A brief discussion should be attached addressing the following:
 - ➔ **Earlier analyses used** – Identify earlier analyses and state where they are available for review.
 - ➔ **Impacts adequately addressed** – Identify which effects from the above checklist were within the scope of, and adequately analyzed in, an earlier document pursuant to applicable legal standards. Also, state whether such effects were addressed by mitigation measures based on the earlier analysis.
 - ➔ **Mitigation measures** – For effects that are checked as "Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures," describe the mitigation measures which were incorporated or refined from the earlier document and the extent to which they address site-specific conditions for the project.
- g) References to information sources for potential impacts (i.e. General Plans/Community Plans, zoning ordinances) should be incorporated into the checklist. Reference to a previously-prepared or outside document should include a reference to the pages or chapters where the statement is substantiated. A source list should be attached and other sources used, or individuals contacted, should be cited in the discussion.

I. AESTHETICS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect on a scenic vista? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, rock outcroppings, and historic buildings, within a state scenic highway? (PLN)			X	
3. Substantially degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings? (PLN)			X	
4. Create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area? (PLN)			X	

The project site is currently disturbed from its natural state. The site contains gravel, dirt, some A/C paving together with a stream environment zone flowing along the southern and westerly property lines. The project site is surrounded by the existing operations of the Sierra Pacific Power Company, the North Tahoe Public Utility District Building and Maintenance Yard and the North Tahoe Regional Park.

Discussion- Items I-1,3:

The proposed project site is not within a scenic vista and will not create a substantial adverse scenic impact. The project site is located within an area that is disturbed with existing buildings and commercial and public service uses. The proposed building will not degrade the existing visual character or quality of the site and its surroundings in that the proposed building will reduce the existing outdoor vehicle storage which currently exists on the project site. No trees will be removed as a result of the proposed project. The project proposal will not create a significant adverse impact on the scenic area or within the surrounding area. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item I-2:

There are no historic buildings within the vicinity of the proposed project site and the site is not within a state scenic highway. The project site will not substantially damage scenic resources, including, but not limited to, trees, and rock outcroppings. There are no rock outcroppings within the project area of disturbance and no trees are to be removed as a result of the project. Minimal disturbance will occur for the proposed project. The Stream Environmental Zone (SEZ) will not be impacted by the construction of the building. The building, driveway, and parking lot improvements will be located at a minimum of 25-feet from the top of the bank of the SEZ. The 25-foot setback is the required setback therefore ensuring that the project will not impact the SEZ. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item I-4:

The project proposes minimal lighting on the building and within the parking lot area. The lighting proposed will not create a new source of substantial light or glare, which would adversely affect day or nighttime views in the area in that the lighting will be minimal compared to the existing lighting of the surrounding uses. Furthermore, the project lighting will be required to be reviewed by the North Tahoe Site Design Review Committee to ensure that there will be no lighting impacts generated from the project site. No mitigation measures are required.

II. AGRICULTURAL RESOURCE – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations? (PLN)				X
3. Conflict with existing zoning for agricultural use, or a Williamson Act contract? (PLN)				X
4. Involve other changes in the existing environment which, due to their location or nature, could result in conversion of Farmland (including livestock grazing) to non-agricultural use? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Item II-1:

The proposed project will not convert Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland, or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland), as shown on the maps prepared pursuant to the Farmland Mapping and Monitoring Program of the California Resources Agency, to non-agricultural use in that the project site is not located within an area deemed as Prime Farmland, Unique Farmland or Farmland of Statewide or Local Importance (Farmland).

Discussion- Item II-2:

The project site is located within the North Tahoe General Plan, Tahoe Vista. There are no policies within the North Tahoe General Plan, Tahoe Vista regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations. Therefore, it can be determined that the proposed B&G Excavation Yard will not conflict with the North Tahoe General Plan or other policies regarding land use buffers for agricultural operations.

Discussion- Item II-3:

The project site is zoned Public Service / Industrial and will not conflict with agricultural use, in that there are no agricultural uses within the general vicinity of the project site which may be affected by the project. Furthermore, there is no Williamson Act contract in place for the project site area.

Discussion- Item II-4:

The project site is currently used for the excavation business. The construction of a building for the excavation business and on-site improvements will not result in conversion of Farmland to non-agricultural use in that the site is not currently used as Farmland.

III. AIR QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Conflict with or obstruct implementation of the applicable air quality plan? (APCD)				X
2. Violate any air quality standard or contribute substantially to an existing or projected air quality violation? (APCD)			X	

3. Result in a cumulatively considerable net increase of any criteria for which the project region is non-attainment under an applicable federal or state ambient air quality standard (including releasing emissions which exceed quantitative thresholds for ozone precursors)? (APCD)			X	
4. Expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations? (APCD)				X
5. Create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people? (APCD)			X	

Discussion- Item III-1:

Based upon the project description the project will not conflict the Air Quality Plan.

Discussion- Items III-2,3:

This proposed project is located in the Mountain Counties Air Basin portion of Placer County. This area is designated as non-attainment for the federal and state ozone standard and non-attainment for the state particulate matter standard. According to the project description, the project will not result in a significant increase in regional and local emissions from construction and operation.

The project related short & long term air pollutant emissions will result primarily from diesel-powered construction equipment, trucks hauling building supplies, vehicle exhaust, landscape maintenance equipment, water heater and air conditioning energy use. Based on the proposed project, the project will not exceed the District's thresholds. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items III-4,5:

Based upon the project description the project will not expose sensitive receptors to substantial pollutant concentrations nor create objectionable odors affecting a substantial number of people. No mitigation measures are required.

IV. BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)			X	
2. Substantially reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of restrict the range of an endangered, rare, or threatened species? (PLN)			X	
3. Have a substantial adverse effect on the environment by converting oak woodlands? (PLN)				X
4. Have a substantial adverse effect on any riparian habitat or other sensitive natural community identified in local or regional plans, policies or regulations or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service? (PLN)			X	
5. Have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means? (PLN)			X	

6. Interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites? (PLN)			X	
7. Conflict with any local policies or ordinances protecting biological resources, such as a tree preservation policy or ordinance? (PLN)				X
8. Conflict with the provisions of an adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- Items IV-1,2,4,6:

The proposed project area is bounded by existing businesses and residential uses. Ongoing activities in the project area and surrounding areas include public service buildings and maintenance yards, offices, residences, and the North Tahoe Recreational Park. The proposed project will not interfere with the existing business operations or the recreational uses of the park. The site is disturbed and contains minimal vegetation, including low-lying shrubs and there are no trees within any new land disturbance.

No trees will be removed as a result of the proposed project and minimal disturbance to the existing vegetation. The project proposes to re-vegetate the areas of disturbance provide for erosion control, BMP's, soil stabilization plan, etc. which if incorporated into the project will ensure that there are no significant impacts created with the construction of the project.

The project will not have a substantial adverse effect, either directly or through habitat modifications, on any species identified as a candidate, sensitive, or special status species in local or regional plans, policies or regulations, or by the California Department of Fish & Game or U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service in that no special species have been identified on the project site. Furthermore, the project will not reduce the habitat of a fish or wildlife species, cause a fish or wildlife population to drop below self-sustaining levels, threaten to eliminate a plant or animal community, substantially reduce the number of an endangered, rare, or threatened species in that the site is currently disturbed and the improvements proposed require minimal removal of trees and existing vegetation which could support habitat. Additionally, the project will not interfere substantially with the movement of any native resident or migratory fish or wildlife species or with established native resident or migratory wildlife corridors, or impede the use of native wildlife nursery sites. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IV-3:

There are no oak woodlands within the project site or surrounding areas.

Discussion- Item IV-5:

There are no known or mapped wetlands within the general vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the project will not have a substantial adverse effect on federally protected wetlands as defined by Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (including, but not limited to, marsh, vernal pool, coastal, etc.) through direct removal, filling, hydrological interruption, or other means. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IV-7:

The project as designed does not conflict with the Placer County Tree Preservation Ordinance adopted in October of 1991 in that there are no trees proposed to be removed.

Discussion- Item IV-8:

There is no known adopted Habitat Conservation Plan, Natural Community Conservation Plan, or other approved local, regional, or state habitat conservation plan applicable to the project site. The project site is currently disturbed and contains minimal vegetation.

V. CULTURAL RESOURCES – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a historical resource as defined in CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
2. Substantially cause adverse change in the significance of a unique archaeological resource pursuant to CEQA Guidelines, Section 15064.5? (PLN)				X
3. Directly or indirectly destroy a unique paleontological resource or site or unique geologic feature? (PLN)			X	
4. Have the potential to cause a physical change, which would affect unique ethnic cultural values? (PLN)			X	
5. Restrict existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area? (PLN)			X	
6. Disturb any human remains, including those interred outside of formal cemeteries? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Item V-1:

The project site is not listed in, or determined to be eligible by the State Historical Resources Commission, for listing in the California Register of Historical Resources therefore, the project will not substantially cause adverse changes in the significance of a historical resource.

Discussion- Item V-2:

The project site area has already been disturbed for the existing use of a contractor's yard. There are no known historic monuments within the general vicinity of the project site. There are no known unique archaeological resources within the project site area.

Discussion- Items V-3,4,5,6:

The project site is an existing parcel graded and disturbed with the installation of gravel, some dirt areas and A/C paving. At this time there are no known unique paleontological resources or sites or unique geologic features that will be directly or indirectly destroyed with the construction of the project. Furthermore, the physical change of the project site will not affect unique ethnic cultural values as none have been identified within the project site area with the original disturbance and none have been identified within the general vicinity of the project site. Additionally, there are no existing religious or sacred uses within the potential impact area. The project site is not located within a formal cemetery. No mitigation measures are required.

VI. GEOLOGY & SOILS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Expose people or structures to unstable earth conditions or changes in geologic substructures? (ESD)				X
2. Result in significant disruptions, displacements, compaction or overcrowding of the soil? (ESD)		X		
3. Result in substantial change in topography or ground surface relief features? (ESD)			X	

4. Result in the destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features? (ESD)			X	
5. Result in any significant increase in wind or water erosion of soils, either on or off the site? (ESD)		X		
6. Result in changes in deposition or erosion or changes in siltation which may modify the channel of a river, stream, or lake? (ESD)		X		
7. Result in exposure of people or property to geologic and geomorphological (i.e. Avalanches) hazards such as earthquakes, landslides, mudslides, ground failure, or similar hazards? (ESD)			X	
8. Be located on a geological unit or soil that is unstable, or that would become unstable as a result of the project, and potentially result in on or off-site landslide, lateral spreading, subsidence, liquefaction, or collapse? (ESD)				X
9. Be located on expansive soils, as defined in Table 18, 1-B of the Uniform Building Code (1994), creating substantial risks to life or property? (ESD)			X	

Discussion - Item VI-1:

No indications of unstable soil were observed during staff site review for the project area or the surrounding areas.

Discussion - Item VI-2:

This project proposal would result in disturbance of approximately 90% of the 1.09 acre parcel for the grading and construction of approximately 4300 square foot contractor's office building with 3250 square feet of attached covered storage yard and associated parking and circulation areas. Currently the site is vacant with existing asphalt driveway aprons which is comprised of approximately 3750 square feet of impervious surface. The site also includes a seasonal drainage that meanders along the north and east property line and has been classified by TRPA as a Stream Environmental Zone (SEZ). Proposed grading within this environmentally sensitive area is limited to a 4' X 4' rock protection overflow between the extended detention basin and the SEZ. After construction, approximately 32% (15,000 square feet) of the site will be paved. Approximately 168 cubic yards of material will be exported from the site as a result of grading activities and aggregate base, asphalt cement, and drain rock will be imported for the construction of the parking and circulation areas. As a result, disruption of soils on-site for the building pad and associated parking/circulation areas is potentially significant. The proposed project's impacts associated with soil disruptions, displacements, and compaction of the soil can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigations:

Mitigation Measures - Item VI-2:

MM VI.1 The applicant shall prepare and submit Improvement Plans, specifications and cost estimates (per the requirements of Section II of the Land Development Manual [LDM] that are in effect at the time of submittal) to the Engineering and Surveying Division (ESD) for review and approval. The plans shall show all conditions for the project as well as pertinent topographical features both on- and off-site. All existing and proposed utilities and easements, on-site and adjacent to the project, which may be affected by planned construction, shall be shown on the plans. All landscaping and irrigation facilities within the public right-of-way (or public easements), or landscaping within sight distance areas at intersections, shall be included in the Improvement Plans. The applicant shall pay plan check and inspection fees. Prior to plan approval, all applicable recording and reproduction cost shall be paid. The cost of the above-noted landscape and irrigation facilities shall be included in the estimates used to determine these fees. It is the applicant's responsibility to obtain all required agency signatures on the plans and to secure department approvals. If the Design/Site Review process and/or DRC review is required as a condition of approval for the project, said review process shall be completed prior to submittal of Improvement Plans. Record drawings shall be prepared and signed by a California Registered Civil Engineer at the applicant's expense and shall be submitted to the ESD prior to acceptance by the County of site improvements.

MM VI.2 All proposed grading, drainage improvements, vegetation and tree removal shall be shown on the Improvement Plans and all work shall conform to provisions of the County Grading Ordinance (Ref. Article 15.48, Placer County Code) that are in effect at the time of submittal. No grading, clearing, or tree disturbance shall occur until the Improvement Plans are approved and all temporary construction fencing has been installed and inspected

by a member of the DRC. All cut/fill slopes shall be at 2:1 (horizontal:vertical) unless a soils report supports a steeper slope and the ESD concurs with said recommendation.

The applicant shall revegetate all disturbed areas. Revegetation undertaken from April 1 to October 1 shall include regular watering to ensure adequate growth. A winterization plan shall be provided with project Improvement Plans. It is the applicant's responsibility to assure proper installation and maintenance of erosion control/winterization during project construction. Where soil stockpiling or borrow areas are to remain for more than one construction season, proper erosion control measures shall be applied as specified in the Improvement Plans. Provide for erosion control where roadside drainage is off of the pavement, to the satisfaction of the ESD.

Submit to the ESD a letter of credit or cash deposit in the amount of 110% of an approved engineer's estimate for winterization and permanent erosion control work prior to Improvement Plan approval, if required by the ESD, to guarantee protection against erosion and improper grading practices. Upon the County's acceptance of improvements, and satisfactory completion of a one-year maintenance period, unused portions of said deposit shall be refunded to the project applicant or authorized agent.

If, at any time during construction, a field review by County personnel indicates a significant deviation from the proposed grading shown on the Improvement Plans, specifically with regard to slope heights, slope ratios, erosion control, winterization, tree disturbance, and/or pad elevations and configurations, the plans shall be reviewed by the DRC/ESD for a determination of substantial conformance to the project approvals prior to any further work proceeding. Failure of the DRC/ESD to make a determination of substantial conformance may serve as grounds for the revocation/modification of the project approval by the appropriate hearing body.

Discussion- Item VI-3:

The project site is mostly bare soil and mostly flat. The project is an in-fill project (is surrounded by projects already commercially developed) and proposes a maximum cut of approximately 1.5' which will not result in a substantial change in topography. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VI-4:

The project site includes approximately 320 lineal feet of 15'+ wide seasonal drainage which has been classified by TRPA as Stream Environment Zone (SEZ). Proposed grading within this environmentally sensitive area is limited to a 4' X 4' rock protection overflow between the extended detention basin and the SEZ. There are no other known unique geologic or physical features, therefore the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Items VI-5,6:

This project proposal would result in disturbance of approximately 90% of the 1.09 acre parcel for the grading and construction of a 4300 square foot contractor's office building with 3250 square feet of attached covered storage yard and associated parking and circulation areas. Proposed grading within the SEZ is limited to a 4' X 4' rock protection overflow between the extended detention basin and the SEZ. Erosion potential and water quality impacts are always present during construction and occur when protective vegetative cover is removed and soils are disturbed. In this case, it is primarily the construction of the building, associated parking lot, frontage improvements, and on-site drainage improvements that could contribute to erosion and water quality degradation. Soil disruption also has the potential to increase siltation of tributaries to Lake Tahoe. Existing drainage is primarily infiltrated into the soil and sheet flows to the existing seasonal drainage swale. The impervious cover created by construction of the building and associated asphalt concrete parking facilities will increase runoff flows from the site. However, stormwater runoff is proposed to be collected and pre-treated with an approved pre-treatment vault prior to discharging to a proposed extended detention basin designed to provide subsurface infiltration to handle the parking lot runoff and infiltrate it to soil beneath the pavement, with overflows being discharged to the existing seasonal drainage swale. Peak flows to the drainage swale will not exceed pre-project peak flows. By handling stormwater flows during dry and wet seasons on site, sediment loading increases to drainage ways will be minimized. The proposed project's impacts associated with increase in erosion potential of soils and changes in siltation to natural waterways can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigations:

Mitigation Measures - Item VI-5,6:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

Refer to text in MM VI.3

MM VI.4 Staging Areas: Stockpiling and/or vehicle staging areas shall be identified on the Improvement Plans and located as far as practical from existing dwellings and protected resources in the area.

MM VI.5 Prepare and submit with the project Improvement Plans, a drainage report in conformance with the requirements of Section 5 of the LDM and the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, to the Engineering and Surveying Department or DPW for review and approval. The report shall be prepared by a Registered Civil Engineer and shall, at a minimum, include: A written text addressing existing conditions, the effects of the improvements, all appropriate calculations, a watershed map, increases in downstream flows, proposed on- and off-site improvements and drainage easements to accommodate flows from this project. The report shall identify water quality protection features and methods to be used both during construction and for long-term post-construction water quality protection. "Best Management Practice" (BMP) measures shall be provided to reduce erosion, water quality degradation, and prevent the discharge of pollutants to stormwater to the maximum extent practicable. The drainage report shall also address any additional BMPs required by Lahontan RWQCB or by TRPA.

MM VI.6 Projects with ground disturbance exceeding one-acre that are subject to construction stormwater quality permit requirements of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program shall obtain such permit from the State Regional Water Quality Control Board and shall provide to the Engineering and Surveying Department evidence of a state-issued WDID number or filing of a Notice of Intent and fees prior to start of construction.

MM VI.7 Prior to Improvement Plan approval, provide the ESD with permits/comments from TRPA indicating their approval.

Discussion- Item VI-7:

The site is located within Seismic Zone 3 and ground shaking will occur during seismic events on nearby active faults. If structures are constructed according to the current edition of the California Building Code, the likelihood of severe damage due to ground shaking should be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VI-8:

There is no known landsliding or slope instability related to the project site.

Discussion- Item VI-9:

According to the USDA Soil Conservation Service, the project area is indicative of a soil type that is anticipated to have a moderate shrink-swell potential. The proposed project's impacts associated with expansive soils can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the standards of the Uniform Building Code (UBC). No mitigation measures are required.

VII. HAZARDS & HAZARDOUS MATERIALS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use, or disposal of hazardous or acutely hazardous materials? (EHS)			X	
2. Create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through reasonably foreseeable upset and accident conditions involving the release of hazardous materials into the environment? (EHS)			X	
3. Emit hazardous emissions, substances, or waste within one-quarter mile of an existing or proposed school? (APCD)			X	
4. Be located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result, would it create a significant hazard to the public or the environment? (EHS)				X

5. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area? (PLN)				X
6. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area? (PLN)				X
7. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving wildland fires, including where wildlands are adjacent to urbanized areas or where residences are intermixed with wildlands? (PLN)			X	
8. Create any health hazard or potential health hazard? (EHS)				X
9. Expose people to existing sources of potential health hazards? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Item VII-1:

This project is not likely to create a significant hazard to the public or the environment through the routine handling, transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials. This project will conduct minor maintenance on excavating equipment used in the course of business. The quantities of hazardous waste involved for minor maintenance is below regulatory thresholds and thus is considered to be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VII-2:

The use of hazardous substances during normal construction and residential activities is expected to be limited in nature, and will be subject to standard handling and storage requirements. Accordingly, impacts related to the release of hazardous substances are considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VII-3:

Based upon the project description, the operations will not emit hazardous emissions. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VII-4:

The project is not located on a site which is included on a list of hazardous materials sites compiled pursuant to Government Code Section 65962.5 and, as a result will not create a significant hazard to the public or the environment.

Discussion- Items VII-5,6:

The project site is not located within the Truckee Tahoe Airport Land Use Compatibility Plan applicable to the Truckee – Tahoe area. Therefore, the project is not within two miles of the Truckee Tahoe Airport and will not result in a safety hazard for people residing or working in the project area. Additionally, there are no private airstrips within the vicinity of the project site which would result in a safety hazard for people residing in the project area.

Discussion- Item VII-7:

The location of the project site is not within an area designated as an evacuation area or part of an adopted emergency response plan. The construction of the project will not interfere with any emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan in place for the National Avenue Industrial / Public Service Area in that there is no emergency response plan or emergency evacuation plan currently in place for the site of which the project is proposed. The applicants will be required to comply with the requirements of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District and Placer County Department of Environmental Health, specifically as it relates to an emergency evacuation plan for the employees and visitors of the site as it relates to the fuel storage proposed on the project site. Complying with the requirements of the North Tahoe Fire Protection District and Environmental Health will ensure that there are no significant impacts associated with the on-site fuel storage. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VII-8:

The project will not create any health hazard or potential health hazards.

Discussion- Item VII-9:

A Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment was conducted on this project site which consisted of a past records search and related review. The Phase 1 Environmental Site Assessment did not identify any past uses known to be associated with human health hazards. As such, the exposure of people to existing sources of potential health hazards is considered to be less than significant.

VIII. HYDROLOGY & WATER QUALITY – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Violate any potable water quality standards? (EHS)				X
2. Substantially deplete groundwater supplies or interfere substantially with groundwater recharge such that there would be a net deficit in aquifer volume or a lessening of local groundwater supplies (i.e. the production rate of pre-existing nearby wells would drop to a level which would not support existing land uses or planned uses for which permits have been granted)? (EHS)				X
3. Substantially alter the existing drainage pattern of the site or area? (ESD)			X	
4. Increase the rate or amount of surface runoff? (ESD)		X		
5. Create or contribute runoff water which would include substantial additional sources of polluted water? (ESD)		X		
6. Otherwise substantially degrade surface water quality?(ESD)		X		
7. Otherwise substantially degrade ground water quality? (EHS)				X
8. Place housing within a 100-year flood hazard area as mapped on a federal Flood Hazard boundary or Flood Insurance Rate Map or other flood hazard delineation map? (ESD)				X
9. Place within a 100-year flood hazard area improvements which would impede or redirect flood flows? (ESD)				X
10. Expose people or structures to a significant risk of loss, injury or death involving flooding, including flooding as a result of the failure of a levee or dam? (ESD)				X
11. Alter the direction or rate of flow of groundwater? (EHS)				X
12. Impact the watershed of important surface water resources, including but not limited to Lake Tahoe, Folsom Lake, Hell Hole Reservoir, Rock Creek Reservoir, Sugar Pine Reservoir, French Meadows Reservoir, Combie Lake, and Rollins Lake? (EHS, ESD)		X		

Discussion- Item VIII-1:

The project will not violate any potable water quality standards as it will use a public treated water supply.

Discussion- Items VIII-2,11:

The project proposes the use of public treated surface water supplies, so there are no direct impacts to groundwater quantity or direction due to well withdrawals. As this project does not involve disturbance of major drainage ways, impacts related to groundwater recharge are considered less than significant.

Discussion- Item VIII-3:

The existing drainage is via sheet flow. Flows which are not infiltrated into soil run off-site to either the Donner Road roadside drainage or to an existing seasonal drainage swale that exists adjacent to the north and east property lines. Flows that are not infiltrated will be discharged to the existing drainage swale at less than pre-project peak flows in a similar drainage pattern as exists today. Therefore, the impact would be less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item VIII-4:

This project will disturb approximately 90% of the entire site 1.09 acre site, which is currently vacant and undeveloped, to construct an approximately 4300 square foot contractor's office building with 3250 square feet of attached covered storage yard and associated parking and circulation areas. The existing drainage is via sheet flow. Flows which are not infiltrated into soil run off-site to either the Donner Road roadside drainage or to an existing seasonal drainage swale that exists adjacent to the north and east property lines. Drainage flows in a southeast direction eventually adds to tributaries of Lake Tahoe. The project will create impervious cover over approximately 55% of the site which will increase the rate and amount of surface water runoff. However, the project proposes that all project area flows collect and drain towards the south and east sides of the lot, which is proposed to be collected in a pre-treatment vault and then discharged to an extended detention basin for infiltration on-site and to attenuate 10-yr and 100-yr peak flows. The increased impervious surface has the potential to increase surface runoff which could in turn alter the existing drainage pattern. The proposed project's impacts associated with an increase in the rate or amount of surface runoff can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the Placer County General Plan and North Tahoe Community Plan Goals and Policies as well as the following mitigations:

Mitigation Measures - Item VIII-4:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

Refer to text in MM VI.4

MM VIII.1 Storm water run-off shall be reduced to pre-project conditions through the installation of retention/detention facilities. Retention/detention facilities shall be designed in accordance with the requirements of the Placer County Storm Water Management Manual that are in effect at the time of submittal, and to the satisfaction of the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). No retention/detention facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

Discussion- Items VIII-5,6,12:

The construction of the proposed improvements has the potential to degrade water quality. Removal of topsoil and existing vegetation on this currently vacant parcel will expose soils, creating the potential for contamination of storm water runoff with sediment and other construction related pollutants such as oils/greases, suspended solids, trace metals, fertilizers, etc. Post-construction parking lot operations present the potential for storm water degradation from contaminants that include (but are not limited to) suspended solids, nutrients, oils/greases, construction waste, metals, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, etc. Additionally, the proposed car washing activities, as well as the fueling area, has the potential to result in the generation of new dry-weather runoff containing said pollutants and also has the potential to increase the concentration and/or total load of said pollutants in wet weather stormwater runoff. The proposed project is located approximately one-quarter mile from Lake Tahoe, a sensitive water body. To ensure no direct or indirect discharge of sediments into Lake Tahoe, temporary and permanent water quality best management practices will be incorporated into construction activities and project design. The project will contain the majority of stormwater runoff on site and treat it with a pre-treatment filtration system and discharge to a proposed extended detention basin to allow infiltration into soils below the pavement. The proposed project's impacts associated with surface water quality degradation can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing the following mitigations:

Mitigation Measures - Items VIII-5,6,12:

Refer to text in MM VI.1

Refer to text in MM VI.2

Refer to text in MM VI.3

Refer to text in MM VI.4

Refer to text in MM VI.5

Refer to text in MM VI.6

MM VIII.2 Storm drainage from on and off-site impervious surfaces shall be collected and routed through specially designed catch basins, vegetated swales, vaults, infiltration basins, water quality basins, filters, etc. for entrapment of sediment, debris and oils/greases or other identified pollutants, as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD). The applicant shall provide for the establishment of vegetation, where specified, by means of proper irrigation, for effective performance of BMPs. No water quality facility construction shall be permitted within any identified wetlands area, floodplain, or right-of-way, except as authorized by project approvals.

MM VIII.3 The fuel dispensing area shall be covered with an overhanging roof structure or canopy. The canopy shall not drain onto the fuel dispensing area, and the canopy downspouts must be routed to prevent drainage across the fueling area. The fuel dispensing area shall be paved with Portland cement concrete and have a minimum 2% slope, with separation from the rest of the site by a grade break to prevent run-on of stormwater.

MM VIII.4 Water quality treatment facilities (BMPs) shall be designed according to the guidance of the California Stormwater Quality Association Stormwater Best Management Practice Handbooks for Construction, for New Development / Redevelopment, and for Industrial and Commercial (or other similar source as approved by the Engineering and Surveying Department (ESD)) and in accordance with the requirements of TRPA and the Lahontan Regional Water Quality Control Board. BMPs shall be designed to mitigate (minimize, infiltrate, filter, or treat) stormwater runoff. Flow or volume based post-construction BMPs shall be designed at a minimum in accordance with the Placer County Guidance Document for Volume and Flow-Based Sizing of Permanent Post-Construction Best Management Practices for Stormwater Quality Protection. BMPs for the project include, but are not limited to: infiltration galleries, soil stabilization, revegetation, and pervious pavement. All BMPs shall be maintained as required to insure effectiveness. Proof of on-going maintenance, such as contractual evidence, shall be provided to ESD upon request.

Discussion- Item VIII-7:

The project will not otherwise degrade groundwater quality.

Discussion - Items VIII-8,9,10:

The project site is not within a 100-year flood hazard area as defined and mapped by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). No improvements are proposed within a 100-year flood hazard area and no flood flows would be impeded or redirected. The project location is elevated above areas that are subject to flooding as a result of failure of a levee or dam.

IX. LAND USE & PLANNING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Physically divide an established community? (PLN)				X
2. Conflict with General Plan/Community Plan/Specific Plan designations or zoning, or Plan policies? (EHS, ESD, PLN)			X	
3. Conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects? (PLN)			X	
4. Result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts? (PLN)				X
5. Affect agricultural and timber resources or operations (i.e. impacts to soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans, or impacts from incompatible land uses)? (PLN)				X

6. Disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of an established community (including a low-income or minority community)? (PLN)				X
7. Result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of an area? (PLN)			X	
8. Cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Item IX-1:

The project as proposed will not physically divide an established community in that the proposed use currently operates on the subject parcel.

Discussion- Item IX-2:

The project site is located within the North Tahoe General Plan, Tahoe Vista Community Plan Area, Special Area #5, Industrial / Public Service Area per the Tahoe Vista Community Plan Land Use District Map. The Plan envisions the implementation of the industrial park concept of contained service/industrial uses within a screened and buffered area. Pavement and building should be in the center, roads and parking should be designed for large vehicles. Land uses consist of contractor yards but would require the greatest need for screening. Furthermore, uses of less impact, i.e. storage, offices, are acceptable. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-3:

The project will not conflict with any applicable habitat conservation plan or natural community conservation plan or other County policies, plans, or regulations adopted for purposes of avoiding or mitigating environmental effects. The project as designed will avoid any environmental effects to habitat. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-4:

The project site is currently used as storage/contractor yard for the excavation business owned and operated by the project proponents. As described within IX.2 discussion, the project will not result in the development of incompatible uses and/or the creation of land use conflicts.

Discussion- Item IX-5:

The project will not affect agricultural and timber resources or operations in that the project will not impact soils or farmlands and timber harvest plans or create an incompatible land use.

Discussion- Item IX-6:

The established community is mainly industrial and public service providers. Therefore, the project will not disrupt or divide the physical arrangement of the established public service/industrial community. The project will not divide the physical arrangement of a low-income or minority community in that the subject parcel is located in between existing industrial and public service uses.

Discussion- Item IX-7:

The project proposes the construction of a building for the existing operations of an excavation business. The project will result in an alteration to the existing character of the project site; however, it will not result in a substantial alteration of the present or planned land use of the area. The project includes improvements to the project site which include constructing a 4,284 square foot building, with 3,250 square feet of covered storage for the use of storing and maintaining vehicles associated with the excavation business and an office, paving, water quality improvements, etc. which provide for a better use of the parcel than how it is currently being used. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item IX-8:

The project as proposed will not cause economic or social changes that would result in significant adverse physical changes to the environment such as urban decay or deterioration. The intent of the project is to provide for indoor storage of the vehicles associated with the business, organized parking, covered storage, improvements to the site such as paving, water quality improvements, etc. which will not cause urban decay, deterioration or blight. No mitigation measures are required.

X. MINERAL RESOURCES – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. The loss of availability of a known mineral resource that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state? (PLN)				X
2. The loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource recovery site delineated on a local general plan, specific plan or other land use plan? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

There are no known mineral resources that would be of value to the region and the residents of the state within the project site area. Furthermore, concluding that there will not be a loss of availability of a locally-important mineral resource, in that there is not a recovery site delineated within the North Tahoe General Plan.

XI. NOISE – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exposure of persons to or generation of noise levels in excess of standards established in the local General Plan, Community Plan or noise ordinance, or applicable standards of other agencies? (EHS)			X	
2. A substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)				X
3. A substantial temporary or periodic increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity above levels existing without the project? (EHS)			X	
4. For a project located within an airport land use plan or, where such a plan has not been adopted, within two miles of a public airport or public use airport, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				X
5. For a project within the vicinity of a private airstrip, would the project expose people residing or working in the project area to excessive noise levels? (EHS)				X

Discussion- Items XI-1,3:

Construction of the project, through build-out, will increase ambient noise levels. Adjacent residents may be negatively impacted. This impact is considered to be temporary and less than significant. A condition of approval for the project will be recommended that limits construction hours so that evening and early mornings, as well as all day on Sunday, will be free of construction noise. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion- Item XI-2:

There will not be a substantial permanent increase in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity as the project itself is located in a light industrial/commercial area.

Discussion- Item XI-4:

The project is not located within an airport land use plan and would not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels from aircraft.

Discussion- Item XI-5:

The project is not located within the vicinity of a private airstrip and would not expose people working in the project area to excessive noise levels from aircraft.

XII. POPULATION & HOUSING – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Induce substantial population growth in an area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure)? (PLN)				X
2. Displace substantial numbers of existing housing, necessitating the construction of replacement housing elsewhere? (PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The project site is located within the existing operations of a public service/industrial area. The project site will not induce substantial population growth in the Tahoe Vista area, either directly (i.e. by proposing new homes and businesses) or indirectly (i.e. through extension of roads or other infrastructure) in that the project is for the construction and improvements of an existing industrial site which will not create the need for additional homes or businesses nor is within an area currently developed with roads or other infrastructure providing access to residences. Furthermore, the construction of the 4,284 square foot commercial/light industrial building, 3,250 square feet of covered storage and parking, and on-site improvements will not displace any existing housing in that no existing housing exists on the subject parcel nor will the project necessitate the construction of replacement housing in that no existing housing is proposed to be removed or replaced as a result of the proposed project.

XIII. PUBLIC SERVICES – Would the project result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental impacts, in order to maintain acceptable service ratios, response times or other performance objectives for any of the public services?

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Fire protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
2. Sheriff protection? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
3. Schools? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
4. Maintenance of public facilities, including roads? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X
5. Other governmental services? (EHS, ESD, PLN)				X

Discussion- All Items:

The project is for the construction of a 4,225 square foot commercial/light industrial building, with 3,250 square feet of covered storage and parking and will be served by public service providers for both utilities and safety. The project will not result in substantial adverse physical impacts associated with the provision of new or physically altered governmental services and/or facilities. It is intended that the proposed project will be served by the existing service and safety providers and the construction of the commercial/light industrial building will not create a

substantial impact to their service, including but not limited to, response times or other performance objectives of any of the public services.

XIV. RECREATION – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Would the project increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated? (PLN)				X
2. Does the project include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment? (PLN)			X	

Discussion- Item XIV-1:

The project site is currently disturbed and used as for outdoor storage for the excavation business. The closest public park or recreation area is the North Tahoe Regional Park which is approximately one mile from the project site. The proposed commercial/light industrial building will not significantly impact the operations of the park in that the proposed improvements will be contained entirely within the confines of the subject parcel and will not create additional users of the park which may otherwise create a significant impact. The project will not increase the use of existing neighborhood and regional parks or other recreational facilities such that substantial physical deterioration of the facility would occur or be accelerated.

Discussion- Item XIV-2:

The project does not include recreational facilities or require the construction or expansion of recreational facilities which might have an adverse physical effect on the environment in that the project proposes the construction of a commercial / light industrial building with associated on-site improvements. No mitigation measures are required.

XV. TRANSPORTATION & TRAFFIC – Would the project result in:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. An increase in traffic which may be substantial in relation to the existing and/or planned future year traffic load and capacity of the roadway system (i.e. result in a substantial increase in either the number of vehicle trips, the volume to capacity ratio on roads, or congestion at intersections)? (ESD)		X		
2. Exceeding, either individually or cumulatively, a level of service standard established by the County General Plan and/or Community Plan for roads affected by project traffic? (ESD)			X	
3. Increased impacts to vehicle safety due to roadway design features (i.e. sharp curves or dangerous intersections) or incompatible uses (e.g., farm equipment)? (ESD)				X
4. Inadequate emergency access or access to nearby uses? (ESD)				X
5. Insufficient parking capacity on-site or off-site? (ESD, PLN)			X	
6. Hazards or barriers for pedestrians or bicyclists? (ESD)				X

7. Conflicts with adopted policies supporting alternative transportation (i.e. bus turnouts, bicycle racks)? (ESD)				X
8. Change in air traffic patterns, including either an increase in traffic levels or a change in location that results in substantial safety risks? (ESD)				X

Discussion – Item XV-1:

This project proposal would result in the construction of a 4300 square foot contractor's office building with 3250 square feet of attached covered storage yard. The proposed project creates site-specific impacts on local transportation systems that are considered less than significant when analyzed against the existing baseline traffic conditions; however, the cumulative effect of an increase in traffic has the potential to create significant impacts to the area's transportation system. For potential cumulative impacts, the North Tahoe Community Plan includes a fully funded Capital Improvement Program, which with payment of traffic mitigation fees for the ultimate construction of the CIP improvements would reduce the cumulative traffic impacts to less than significant levels. The proposed project's impacts associated with increases in traffic can be mitigated to a less than significant level by implementing applicable Placer County General Plan and North Tahoe Community Plan Goals and Policies as well as the following mitigations:

Mitigation Measures – Item XV-1:

MM XV.1 This project will be subject to the payment of traffic impact fees that are in effect in this area (Tahoe Fee District), pursuant to applicable Ordinances and Resolutions. The applicant is notified that the following traffic mitigation fee(s) will be required and shall be paid to Placer County DPW prior to issuance of any Building Permits for the project:

- County Wide Traffic Limitation Zone: Article 15.28.010, Placer County Code

The current total combined estimated fee is \$22,047. The fees were calculated using the information supplied. If the use or the square footage changes, then the fees will change. The actual fees paid will be those in effect at the time the payment occurs.

Discussion – Item XV-2:

The traffic from the proposed project will have a less than significant impact to the level of service both individually and cumulatively for affected roads and will not exceed the Placer County General Plan and the North Tahoe Community Plan Goals and Policies. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion – Items XV-3,4:

The proposed commercial project is accessed by an existing County maintained road (Donner Road) that meets Placer County design standards and will not affect emergency access to the site or nearby uses.

Discussion – Item XV-5:

The project proposes to provide for adequate parking on-site for the commercial / light industrial use. The parking is proposed in front of the building with a two-way drive aisle in addition to a single drive aisle along the front of the building. Specifically, the project proposes the installation of twenty-one parking spaces consistent with the requirements of the Tahoe Vista Community Plan Area. Specifically, twelve parking spaces are required for industrial services, therefore, it can be determined that there is sufficient parking capacity on-site and no significant impacts will be generated with the parking proposed. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion – Item XV-6:

Frontage improvements for the proposed project are proposed to be consistent with Placer County Standard Plans and Specifications and will not cause hazards or barriers to pedestrians or bicyclists.

Discussion – Item XV-7:

The proposed project will not conflict with any existing, or preclude anticipated future policies, plans, or programs supporting alternative transportation.

Discussion – Item XV-8:

The proposed project is an in-fill project and is not known to affect a change in air traffic patterns.

XVI. UTILITIES & SERVICE SYSTEMS – Would the project:

Environmental Issue	Potentially Significant Impact	Less Than Significant with Mitigation Measures	Less Than Significant Impact	No Impact
1. Exceed wastewater treatment requirements of the applicable Regional Water Quality Control Board? (ESD)			X	
2. Require or result in the construction of new water or wastewater delivery, collection or treatment facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (EHS, ESD)			X	
3. Require or result in the construction of new on-site sewage systems? (EHS)				X
4. Require or result in the construction of new storm water drainage facilities or expansion of existing facilities, the construction of which could cause significant environmental effects? (ESD)				X
5. Have sufficient water supplies available to serve the project from existing entitlements and resources, or are new or expanded entitlements needed? (EHS)			X	
6. Require sewer service that may not be available by the area's waste water treatment provider? (EHS, ESD)			X	
7. Be served by a landfill with sufficient permitted capacity to accommodate the project's solid waste disposal needs? (EHS)			X	
8. Comply with federal, state, and local statutes and regulations related to solid waste? (EHS)			X	

Discussion - Item XVI-1:

Wastewater treatment will be provided by Tahoe Truckee Sanitation District and will not require expansion as a result of the project. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion - Item XVI-2:

Water and sanitary sewer is available within the Donner Road right-of-way. The utility trench that is proposed to tie-in to those existing facilities will be constructed in accordance with Placer County General Plans and Specifications. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion - Item XVI-3:

This project will not require or result in the construction of new septic tank systems as it is served by a public sewer system.

Discussion - Item XVI-4:

This project proposes to discharge to an existing drainage swale with peak flows that do not exceed the pre-project condition. This project does not generate the need for more maintenance than what was expected with the development of the North Tahoe Community Plan.

Discussion - Items XVI-5,7,8:

The agencies charged with providing treated water, sewer services and refuse disposal have indicated their requirements to serve the project. These requirements are routine in nature and do not represent significant impacts. Typical project conditions of approval require submission of "will-serve" letters from each agency. No mitigation measures are required.

Discussion - Item XVI-6:

Wastewater treatment will be provided by the North Tahoe Public Utility District and will not require expansion as a result of the project. Therefore, the impact is considered less than significant. No mitigation measures are required.

E. MANDATORY FINDINGS OF SIGNIFICANCE:

Environmental Issue	Yes	No
1. Does the project have the potential to degrade the quality of the environment or eliminate important examples of the major periods of California history or prehistory?		X
2. Does the project have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? ("Cumulatively considerable" means that the incremental effects of a project are considerable when viewed in connection with the effects of past projects, the effects of other current projects, and the effects of probable future projects.)		X
3. Does the project have environmental effects, which will cause substantial adverse effects on human beings, either directly or indirectly?		X

F. OTHER RESPONSIBLE AND TRUSTEE AGENCIES whose approval is required:

<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Fish and Game	<input type="checkbox"/> Local Agency Formation Commission (LAFCO)
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Department of Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/> National Marine Fisheries Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Tahoe Regional Planning Agency
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Toxic Substances	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Army Corp of Engineers
<input type="checkbox"/> California Department of Transportation	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
<input type="checkbox"/> California Integrated Waste Management Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> California Regional Water Quality Control Board	<input type="checkbox"/> _____

G. DETERMINATION – The Environmental Review Committee finds that:

Although the proposed project **COULD** have a significant effect on the environment, there **WILL NOT** be a significant effect in this case because the mitigation measures described herein have been added to the project. A **MITIGATED NEGATIVE DECLARATION** will be prepared.

H. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW COMMITTEE (Persons/Departments consulted):

Planning Department, Stacy Wydra, Chairperson
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Sharon Boswell
 Engineering and Surveying Department, Wastewater, Ed Wydra
 Department of Public Works, Transportation
 Environmental Health Services, Grant Miller
 Air Pollution Control District, Brent Backus
 Flood Control Districts, Andrew Darrow
 Facility Services, Parks, Vance Kimbrell
 Placer County Fire / CDF, Bob Eicholtz

Signature _____



Gina Langford, Environmental Coordinator

Date _____

April 12, 2007

I. SUPPORTING INFORMATION SOURCES: The following public documents were utilized and site-specific studies prepared to evaluate in detail the effects or impacts associated with the project. This information is

available for public review, Monday through Friday, 8am to 5pm, at the Placer County Community Development Resource Agency, Environmental Coordination Services, 3091 County Center Drive, Suite 190, Auburn, CA 95603.

County Documents	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Community Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Environmental Review Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grading Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Land Development Manual	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Land Division Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater Management Manual	
	<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Ordinance	
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> General Plan, North Tahoe	
Trustee Agency Documents	<input type="checkbox"/> Department of Toxic Substances Control	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
	<input type="checkbox"/> _____	
Site-Specific Studies	Planning Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Biological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Pedestrian Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources Records Search
		<input type="checkbox"/> Lighting & Photometric Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Paleontological Survey
		<input type="checkbox"/> Tree Survey & Arborist Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Visual Impact Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Wetland Delineation
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Engineering & Surveying Department, Flood Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> Phasing Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Grading Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Geotechnical Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Drainage Report
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater & Surface Water Quality BMP Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Pipeline Capacity Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Placer County Commercial/Industrial Waste Survey (where public sewer is available)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Sewer Master Plan
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utility Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Environmental Health Services	<input type="checkbox"/> Groundwater Contamination Report
		<input type="checkbox"/> Hydro-Geological Study
		<input type="checkbox"/> Acoustical Analysis
		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> Soils Screening
		<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary Endangerment Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____

		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Air Pollution Control District	<input type="checkbox"/> CALINE4 Carbon Monoxide Analysis
		<input type="checkbox"/> Construction emission & Dust Control Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Geotechnical Report (for naturally occurring asbestos)
		<input type="checkbox"/> Health Risk Assessment
		<input type="checkbox"/> URBEMIS Model Output
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Fire Department	<input type="checkbox"/> Emergency Response and/or Evacuation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> Traffic & Circulation Plan
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____
	Mosquito Abatement District	<input type="checkbox"/> Guidelines and Standards for Vector Prevention in Proposed Developments
		<input type="checkbox"/> _____